

THE
CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

Vol. I.

March, 1822.

No. 3.

TO OUR PATRONS.

THE EDITOR is happy to learn that the INTELLIGENCER has been generally satisfactory to subscribers, notwithstanding its imperfections. At first, we had but about *two hundred* Patrons for the work, which have since increased to more than *seven* hundred. Several worthy friends have suggested the propriety of making an alteration, by having our numbers smaller, and having them issued oftener; but we think it unadvisable till the first volume is out.

Those Agents and Subscribers who have made *returns* for their subscription will accept the acknowledgments of the EDITOR, who *must be mindful of the outgoes of the Printer*. Confidence is reposed in those who have not found it convenient as yet, to make returns, that they will cheerfully embrace the first opportunity. It should be recollectcd that communications concerning this work, should be *post paid*.

Several typographical errors have escaped correction, though we believe not more than is common to periodical publications.

An error of *words* is found on the 61 p. of the last number. Thus: "The same word which is rendered *deceivable*ness, in the 10th verse (of 2 Thess. 2. Chap.) is rendered *delusion* in the 11th. These *words* are perfectly synonymous," &c. The mistake was made by transcribing and altering the following, which was the original of those sentences, viz. "The word which is rendered *deceivable*ness in the 10th verse, might have been rendered *delusion*, as in verse 11th; these *words* being synonymous," &c. Hence it was not the design of the writer to shew that *deceivable*ness and *delusion* were from the same root, but, simply,

that they were alike incompatible with the character of God. The error was merely of *words*; since no attempt was made to alter the translation or to fault it. If to *delude* be to *deceive*, and a delusion be a deception, it is a matter of total indifference whether derived from the same word or not. As the error was of the most harmless description, and could not deceive as to the main argument, we hope it will be overlooked. Those who pretend it was essential in the illustration, and should lead to a reconsideration of it, are wanting in penetration or candor. Let them show that there is no *deceivableness* in a *strong delusion*, and their corrections, will not be "a puff of empty air." If any have been so far *deluded* as to suppose the error essential to the argument, they are requested to examine the matter for themselves, and be convinced of the contrary. It is the truth that maketh free, and giveth peace to the soul.

IS CHRIST DIVIDED?

If there ever was a time that required the interposition of extraordinary means to prevent the increase of sectarian zeal and blind ambition, among the professors of that religion, which requires us to "let our moderation be known to all men," it is at this time needful. Was it proper for the ghost of a sainted martyr to visit the Churches, and deliver *oracular* instruction, who, that possesses the religion of Jesus, would not prefer incessant solicitations to the God of all grace, that the holy martyr, who indited the above interrogation, might be permitted to revisit the earth, and make an unexpected appearance in every Church, professedly organized and governed according to his directions? To say nothing of their departures from his doctrine, how would their conduct towards each other appear, in the light of his benevolent countenance? While the several *sects* are vociferously judging each other in the name of a Greater than Paul, what reason could they assign, in justification of such conduct? By what authority do we, poor, sinful worms of earth! censure, condemn and judge our fellow beings, because they differ as much from us, as we do from them—and no more! How shall we account for all this unholy

and senseless contention about names, and unjust calumny of another, merely for a difference of opinion? What meaneth that constant whispering in the ear of a brother or sister of the same faith, when the things of which thou speakest concern the whole community? What part of thy Master's cause, must be transacted "in a corner?" Is that the *love* which is "without dissimulation?"

While St. Paul was on earth, he had the infelicity to witness some divisions among Christians, which, by reason of sectarian names, had unhappily obtained considerable strength. With a severity, softened by the mildness of his mission, he expostulated with them, concerning their sudden and unreasonable departure from the worthy name, by which they were called.

What! saith he, "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified? Or were ye baptised in the name of Paul?" But was he to write again, and direct his letter to the Church in New-England, he would not be limited to Paul, Apollos and Cephas. Was he to speak from a pulpit in the clouds of heaven, doubtless it would be his first and principal object to heal the wounds which are made by the tongue of calumny, prevent and repair the divisions which exist among those, who ought to love as brethren, and warm the cold hearts of professors, with the fire of heaven.

But, Oh! what should we now say, Christians, was he to speak to our hearts? Let us imagine ourselves as in his august presence, with his Epistles in one hand, and the other on our breasts, while his finger was pointing us to the following passages, which have been on our tongues from our infancy:

"*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*

"*Thou art inexcusable, O, man, whosoever thou art that judgest another.*

"*Is Christ divided? Are ye not carnal?*"

Should we not blush, and be unable to reply? Are we all willing that other's should read, and hear, and understand for themselves; and ready to treat them as Christians, if they walk as such? Would to heaven that these questions might, like an electric shock, be felt at the same moment, in every heart connected in the Christian profession, though to the most of them invisible.

What would be our feelings should the ghost of Paul relate to us a history of our life, as professors of religion? Omitting our imperfections and errors of judgment; leaving a blank for secret offences, let him expose all the hard speeches, uncharitable suspicions, malicious insinuations and cruelties of disposition, towards each other, as Christians, and should we not complain that *judgment had begun* at the house of God? What denomination would be willing to be rewarded *according to their works*? If in "this life we are forming characters for eternity," who is prepared to meet the decision of justice? Who has meted to others, as he would wish to have it measured to him again?

What excuses can the leaders of various sects frame, for such unyielding opposition to each other? Either they have divided Christ, or perverted both his name and religion.

But, what is it we hear? Let us listen, for a moment! "O Christians! do you not read, 'THE SAINTS SHALL JUDGE THE EARTH?'" I now call you to judgment. Your denunciations of each other, and imprecations upon those you ought to love, while you profess to follow my directions, have echoed above the clouds, and prevented my repose. This moment should I have hung with rapture on the songs of Gabriel, had you not severally pretended to personate me, and adopted my language with your dividing creeds, both to the injury of my influence as an author, the manifest perversion of my doctrine, and the great dis-honor of him, for whose name-sake, I was persecuted on earth. But, pause, that you may have time for sober, solemn reflection. Look at this roll in my hand, that you may see yourself, as in a perfect mirror. Why have you abused each other in the name of him, who rendered good for evil, blessings for curses, and an effectual prayer for his murderous enemies? Had I shown you but *one* of a thousand of your own sins, would not your lips have been sealed to further accusations? You have threatened to rise in testimony against each other, at the bar of the Lord Jesus! Vain mortals! how do you appear before the tribunal of *conscience, scripture and Paul?* Are not such witnesses already impeached? O! remember the words of

the Lord Jesus, 'Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us,' and repent of the evil thou hast committed against thy brother, and thou shalt be *saved from exposure, shame and confusion of face.*'"

Do you say, all this may be the operations of the imagination, and should not be noticed? Call it not the effusion of enthusiasm, or the mere offspring of fancy; but, rather view these questions as the remonstrance of reason, religion and philanthropy against all oppression and persecution in the name of him, who tasted death for *every man*, and must never be *divided* by his FOLLOWERS.

A PHILOSOPHICAL SERMON,

CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF SIN OR MORAL EVIL.

"*Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double-minded.*" James, iv. 8.

THE problems necessary to ascertain the real cause of sin or moral evil, appear to be the following, which we shall attempt to answer, in a candid manner.

'Can a *sinless cause* produce *sin* or moral evil? or, how shall we account for its *origin*, except in the *sinfulness of our nature*? In other words, can a being *commit a sin, before he is a sinner*, any more, than he can *perform a moral action, before he is a moral agent?*'

It will be our object in the reasoning which we offer upon this interesting and difficult subject, to make evident, according to sound reason and scripture, that sin was produced, *independent of a sinful cause*. The argument which we advance is simply this, That the *first* moral evil was *not* the effect of a *preceding* moral evil; or, that *a moral evil did not precede the first*.

It matters not, as it respects this point, philosophically considered, where, or when, or how the *first sin* was produced; because it is self-evident that *the first*, of any thing nameable, could not have been preceded by a *first*. To say a *morally evil cause* is not a *moral evil*, will be found to be a mere evasion; since all which we denominate causes, are but the effects of a preceding cause, and as such, if *moral*, must be *good or evil*. Besides, this evasion refutes

itself; because, if a morally evil cause be *not* a moral evil, the *effect being such*, would *not* be *like* its cause, according to the common acceptation of the phrase. Any *evil* which is not *moral*, cannot, according to the argument we oppose, produce *moral evil*.

Another view of the subject will serve to its illustration. Moral evil cannot precede moral actions; for, if one sin could be committed, independent of moral action or agency, then all sins might; so that a being who *never* acted might be as sinful as though he had done ever so much; and in proving that men are sinners, we should not prove that they are moral agents, or capable of moral action; which is palpably absurd.

Should we admit that the first moral action was evil, it would no more prove the point assumed, than it would that the *first* moral action was the effect of an *anterior* moral action; which is a solecism. So when we acknowledge there was a *first sin*, we yield the point, as none could precede it.

This argument maintains, that moral agents, exercising faculties *as such*, form a moral character, sinful or virtuous; and that previous to action, those faculties constitute no moral character at all. Hence if the *first* moral action be sinful, it forms a sinful character or that of a sinner.

Whether we should be able to produce an example, to prove that an effect is in some instances apparently dissimilar to its cause or not, the above reasoning ought to stand, till fairly refuted. But suppose we select the following: the union and co-operation of matter and spirit, or body and mind. There is such an association of action or reception, that when we place our eyes on a *new* object, we have a *new* thought or idea, which is an effect dependent on a cause. Now I ask—Was the *first* idea produced by a *preceding* one? and if not, does it not go to establish this theory? Is not the reasoning the same, to contend that the *first thought* must have been produced by one *anterior* to it, as that the *first moral evil or sin*, was the effect of a *foregoing sin*? Neither of which is possible! Surely, the *first thought* forms a *new character*, viz. a *thinking being*: and if he could be such without thoughts, he might be *active* without action, a *living soul* without life, and *natural*, *des-stitute of any nature*.

Observe : a being may be capable of thinking, that is, be constituted with all the faculties capable of having thoughts, before they are exercised. But he can no more be sinful without sin, than knowing without knowledge ; so that when he commits a sin, it proves he *is* a sinner, not that he *was* one. The first sin a being commits, no more evinces that he *was* previously sinful, than the first noise an infant makes, shows him to have previously been, a noisy infant.

Suppose we look for the analogy between cause and effect.

Say, the first object producing an idea, is a *dove*. Now, is there a greater likeness between the cause which produced the first idea, and the effect, than between our uncharacterised faculties, and the character we form by them ? Nor does it any more follow that a man is naturally a sinner, because his faculties are liable to be abused, than it does that he is naturally a saint, because moral powers may be devoted to holy purposes. And as certainly as the first of man's *learning* makes him a *learner*, his first *hearing*, a *hearer*, and his first *speaking*, a *speaker*, so certain it is, that the first *sin* constitutes a *sinner* ; that is, something which he *was not*, before the act took place. And who is able to show why the *first act* of learning, constituting a learner, may not as fairly be considered the effect of *previous* learning, as the first sin or moral evil, be called the effect of a preceding evil cause ?

To evade this, we may be told that the sinfulness of actions, consists in the *intention* which dictated them ; and we reply, That is the point to which our attention is directed. Any thing which is *not sin* is out of the question. Suppose the first moral action was an *evil intention* ; it would be the first moral evil. Then the question reverts back with much light. Was the being a sinner *previous* to that intention ? or was that *first* intention the effect of a preceding one ? If that were the first sin, its cause could not be sinful, or a sinful thing has no sin and is sinless ; which is a paradox.

Should it now be contended that we form no new character by the exercise of our faculties ; but, simply exhibit proof of the character already existing : the objection is more plausible than convincing. If we call moral *depravity*

an evil, the question is, was the *first* moral depravity the effect of pre-existing depravity? If not, may we not as well suppose it was produced by *sinless faculties*, as by any other sinless cause? And certainly, no sinfulness could precede *all sin*. It may easily be shown that all characters which are formed by voluntary action, (even in the lowest degree) are in a measure illustrative of this subject; because, if one, we may presume all come under the same rules. We say of a man, he is a *conqueror*: but was he such before he conquered? His bravery and good conduct in the field of battle, did not necessarily constitute him such; because the bravest and best of generals are sometimes defeated. The conduct of the hero in gaining the victory formed the character, *conqueror!* Now is it not as fair to infer, that he was a conqueror before he succeeded in battle, as that he was a sinner previous to the commission of a crime? Besides, if he were such without gaining a victory, he might have remained so, though always defeated. Suppose then that the first sin was murder, or an *intention* to kill. Was the man a murderer *before* he had the *intention*? If so, he might have remained a murderer, though he never had such intention; which is equal to saying, he was a murderer without sin! But when we lay aside pre-conceived opinions and seek for truth, most of those difficulties disappear. Though the cause which produces sin be sinless, it is not virtuous; for virtue is a trait of moral character. All which is sinless is not consequently virtuous: there is a medium between them.

Admit that man is born into the world innocent, or destitute of any more moral character than any other animal; capable of *seeing, hearing, tasting, feeling, smelling*; he relishes delicious food, is pleased with sweet sounds, admires beautiful objects, and learns the features of his friends. As his intellects expand and he improves in knowledge, he prefers his acquaintance, dreads the approach of strangers, smiles when pleased, and screams when afflicted with pain; receives, with expressions of joy, the toy which is agreeable, and thrusts from him, with resentment, the object which he hates. Do any or all of these natural, infantile actions, evince any moral character, properly so called? If they evince either virtue or vice, must we not allow more grades

of moral existence than we now do? Do not other animals, at *three* or *six* months old, exhibit as much moral principle, as a child of the *same age*? Do they not manifest pleasure and displeasure, attachment or anger, much in the same manner? Do you say, the child is proud of praise and exhibits shame when reproved? And do not many other animals exhibit the same, to an equal degree? The actions which belong to early life; and most of all others, are not, in our opinion, properly descriptive of moral character. Our love of life, the preference of happiness to misery, inclination for society, partiality to parents and relatives, the opinion we form of objects presented, and a thousand nameable things, in which, a considerable part of our lives appear, are not, necessarily, either virtuous or vicious. On the other hand, our distaste for certain objects, dread of solitude, disgust at insults, antipathy to certain animals, hatred of offensive behavior, and many other things, are equally undescriptive of moral character. Other creatures have, in their degree, similar feelings, pleasures, antipathies, affections and tempers, and are not morally accountable. Moral faculties must be in exercise to constitute, even in the lowest degree, moral character. *Consciousness*, or the theory of right and wrong, must precede accountability. It is the main-spring of moral nature, and according to its perfection and strength will be the virtuousness or viciousness of our actions. It matters not whether it is *innate*, or produced by the *discipline of the mind*. This consciousness or knowledge of what is required, and what forbidden; or what is virtuous and what is vicious, is the criterion of accountability; and the first act we perform in violation of such conviction, constitutes a sinful character, though perhaps in the lowest degree. Now the *first* such act or sin, could not be the effect of a preceding moral evil, in us.

But should it be asked, whether we should violate such conviction unless *disposed*; and is not that *disposition* a sin? We answer: if by disposition, he meant an *evil intention*, a moral action, we allow it is sinful; but then we must recollect that the *first* such intention, could have no *precedent*. But if by disposition be meant, a law of our nature, or an unavoidable passion which the Author of our being has made indispensable to rational existence, we con-

ceive it would not, necessarily, be sinful. It would no more be a moral evil, than the *strength* of a murderer's arm, or the *fingers* on the hand of a thief. That such a disposition is not necessarily sinful is evident, from the consideration, that sin is a moral action ; and, therefore, no *sin can precede the first such act* ; and nothing is **SINFUL**, without sin. A passion or disposition may exist, and, through a concatenation of circumstances, become the cause of wickedness, and yet not be sinful in its original and detached character. Thus, a man may be in want of *money*, and have a disposition to obtain it, and it is no sin ; though in the end, it may be the cause of a sin's being committed. If it be argued, it is sinful, because, had it not existed, a sin would not have been perpetrated ; it may be replied, with equal propriety, that *every thing else* is sinful, which, not existing, sin would not take place. Hence the *law* would be sinful ; for where there is *no law*, there is no transgression. Reason or common sense would be criminal, for it is the *sine qua non* of our accountability. A want of this world's good and a disposition to obtain it, *may* both exist, and no sin be committed. Suppose a man thus situated, knows it is *right* to deal justly, and *wrong* to defraud, nevertheless, flattering himself that the more speedy and certain accomplishment of his object, by circumvention, will, on the whole, be preferable, he violates the law, designating right and wrong, and commits a crime. Now the original *disposition* to accumulate property, was sinless ; but the *choice of a means* to obtain it, was sinful : it was disobedience to a requisition, *known* to be *morally right*. Actions are not morally right and wrong because man knows they are so ; but he knows it, because they *are such*. All our knowledge is predicated on pre-existing realities. So far from preferring the real difference of moral actions, at least, so far as respects ourselves, we should doubtless have preferred to have them all right. No man would have known sin, if *a law*, or *the law* had not said, "thou shalt," or "thou shalt not." Where *no law* is, there is *no sin*. Our knowledge of moral good and evil, whether imperfect, or perfect, is not the *law* to which we are amenable ; but our accountability is proportionate to our knowledge of a pre-existing law, which fixes the discriminating line, between virtue and vice. Man's

capacity enables him to understand the law, of which God is the Author.

The next step, therefore, in pursuance of the illustration of this hypothesis, is, to compare it with the account of the introduction of sin, as it is learned from the Scriptures of truth. If there be an agreement, we may rely on our system as being correct in principle, however numerous and plausible the objections against it, or feeble our abilities to stand in its defence. If it essentially disagree with that account, we must, as Christians, abandon it at once.

The reader is requested to open his Bible, and carefully read the 2d and 3d chapters of Genesis, and candidly judge of them so far as relates to the introduction of sin. The account appears to be this :

After man was formed of the dust of the ground, he remained innocent, to say the least, till he was influenced to transgress the command of his Maker. His capability of *knowing* "good and evil," *preceded* that knowledge; and the knowledge of right and wrong existed previous to his sin. And further; when his Maker *prohibited* the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, man possessed no moral character; that is, we are not informed that he was either virtuous or vicious, obedient or disobedient.

Even after the formation of Eve, they were both innocent and unsuspecting as the lambs of the field. When the Serpent (whatever it may represent) attempted to seduce the sinless Eve, she candidly *opposed* the temptation, by a recurrence to the *prohibition* of her God; which was a *moral act*; that is, an act in reference to the *command* of a *Superior*. This shows that she was capable of understanding the prohibition, of comparing it with the temptation, and of *relating* her views to the seducer; and that she knew it was *right* to obey, and *wrong* to disobey. Had the case been different, she would not have related to the Serpent, the *liberty* granted, and the *interdiction* enjoined, by her Maker. To succeed in the temptation, the Serpent did not *deny* what Eve *knew*, and had so *accurately* stated; but availed himself of the argument, that by a participation of the forbidden tree, she would know *still more*; and, not only be conscious of right and wrong, "but be as gods, *knowing good and evil*;" that is, the effects of virtue and

vice. The *deception* did not consist in being blinded concerning the moral character of the deed, but, in relation to the *consequences* which would follow. Persuaded that "the tree was *good* for food, *pleasant*, and to be *desired* to make one wise, she did eat." Hence she was so far deceived as to *see* the good and desirable qualities, *without discovering the evil*. The moment the command was violated, the evil was realized, in a measure. The difference between the moral virtue of resisting the temptation, by referring to God's command, and the vice of yielding to it, formed a woful contrast. *Guilt, shame, condemnation and fear of death*, of which nothing before was known, were the consequence. Conscious of what was *required* and what *forbidden*, upon the brief plan which was revealed, the *first act* of disobedience formed a *sinful character*. This account harmonizes with the experience of mankind in general. The *first act* for which we recollect of feeling *condemned*, was the effect of a similar deception; but *not* of our *ignorance* of what was *right* or *wrong*, in relation to the requirement transgressed. We may be sorry for doing mischief, through ignorance; but not guilty. We indulge ourselves in the commission of sins, after we have the knowledge of good and evil, or the rewards of virtue and vice, under the deceptive expectation of escaping the consequences.

This doctrine agrees with the scriptures of the New-Testament. "For where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4. 15. "Whosoever committeth sin, transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." I. John 3. 4. "The Gentiles—having not the law, are a law unto themselves." Rom. 3. 14. "The law was *added* because of transgression," of a *previous* law. A knowledge of the requirement is indispensable to its violation. To commit an infinite sin, infinite obligations must be imposed, which cannot be, without infinite abilities, knowledge and means. To require an infant to exhibit the ingenuity, which would do honor to the meridian talents of a Franklin, is more consistent with justice, than to demand of worms of the dust, obedience to a law, infinitely above their capacity. It would require a miracle to make a rational being amenable to a law, which he never had the means of understanding. From which the inference is unavoidable, that sin, properly so

called, is the violation of what we know is right, just or reasonable ; and the first such act, is the first sin ; *previous* to which, that being was *not* a sinner. Therefore, we are not sinners by nature, properly speaking ; but sinners by PRACTICE. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

UNDERSTANDEST THOU WHAT THOU READEST?

THE Missionary Cause has excited great attention both in Europe and America, and has been patronized by some of the greatest and best of men, as well as those of an opposite character. Confident that we misunderstand the principal object of the Societies, or that the measures adopted are premature and preposterous, we take this method to ascertain facts, that we may co-operate with our brethren, in the promotion of every benevolent and well-timed enterprise.

In reading the sermons, addresses, reports, letters, and miscellaneous intelligence of the day, concerning the Missionary Cause, we are led to form this conclusion ; viz. That the writers mean to be understood, that these Societies are formed for the Salvation of immortal souls, who would forever perish but for the interposition of Christians : That all the Heathens, Jews and Mahometans that do not enjoy the benefits of Christianity in this life, and meet with a saving change before death, will be forever miserable in hell. And also that those Colleges which they found in foreign lands, the sermons which they preach and prayers they offer, prevent the future endless wretchedness of those for whom Christ died.

We should proceed to prove by their express words that we have correctly understood them, but we presume no man will need such proof. They go so far as to state the probable number of *dollars* and *cents*, that will be adequate to the salvation of an *immortal soul*. Now as this is not making "merchandise of *you*," would it not be well to press the question, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" Does the hearer understand his minister when he uses such language as the following? "The silver and gold which you now contribute to the support of this Insti-

tution (*Bangor*) will come into remembrance in the day of judgment, and be the means of increasing your glory in the regions of the blest. Yes, I repeat it, those who have been redeemed from eternal perdition by your silver and gold, will hail you, in heaven, as their benefactors on earth, and ascribe their deliverance from hell to your faithfulness, zeal and liberality. How much ought you then do, for the salvation of those souls that will be required at our hands, at the last day ?" To say nothing of the careless and indifferent manner in which these things are *read* from the pulpit, and the little impression they make on our feelings, shall we not seriously inquire, whether we really understand them ? Would it not be well to open our *eyes*, at least, and ask the pious Doctor, "Understandest thou Dr., what thou readest ? Dost thou mean to teach us, that *silver* and *gold* will save immortal souls, for whom Jesus died ?" Let us propose a few sober and important questions.

1. Do they mean that the millions who have died in Heathen lands, without an opportunity of believing, will perish forever ?

2. Do they really believe God had *an elect number* among them, that will suffer forever, that might have been saved by Missionary labors ?

3. But if he had *no elect ones* in the Heathen nations, in ages past, of what avail would it have been to send them Missionaries ?

4. Which part do they expect to redeem from endless misery, the chosen, or reprobates ?

5. Is there the least danger that the elect will be finally lost, or the least possibility for the *non-elect* to be saved ?

6. Could all the saints on earth or in heaven *save one* of them, who, God *foreknew* would be miserable ; or can all the powers of darkness *prevent* the salvation of them, he *designed to save* ?

We solicit direct answers to these important questions.

When it is made incontrovertibly evident, that any means which we can use can prevent the endless sufferings of a fellow-being, shall we be found drowsy and indifferent ? O merciful God ! O Jesus of Nazareth ! Has the salvation of immortals been neglected in Heaven, and left to the liberality of sinful worms, and shall we *also* be indifferent ? No !

rather would we rush to their relief, by selling all we possess ; or grasping our all, leap into the "Missionary Box," exclaiming,

"Here, Lord, I give myself away
"Tis all that I can do!"

Let us all be burnt as heretics, if when we are convinced our silver and gold would redeem one soul from endless misery, we would not bestow the whole ; or, even as gladly leap into an *ocean of flames* to grasp and save one soul, as do the most zealous Missionaries embark for India, or "sail" at home, on the stormless "Missionary ocean," of which "every cent," contributed for Missionary purposes, "is a precious drop," and the annual income of each society, a STREAM. Let the tongue cleave to the roof of our mouth, if with those sentiments, we should so preach (read) that the doctrine of hell-flames should *freeze* on our lips, or fall in *flakes* on the heads of a drowsy audience !

COMMUNICATION.

MR. STREETER :

Though I do not belong to your meeting nor often find it convenient or proper to hear you preach, yet, I have faithfully read the numbers of your publication, and to my great satisfaction. As I have expressed my opinion of the work to some of my friends, they have desired to read for themselves ; and even among those of the greatest tenacity, the only real objection to it, is, that you "say nothing of conviction, conversion and reformation ;" and as these things are uniformly held up, in the New Testament, as essential to the Christian profession, they conclude you reject them. They would be willing to own you as a Christian, if you confessed and maintained these points. Now, Rev. Sir, I would suggest the propriety of devoting a part of your paper to an illustration of those subjects. Knowing that the New Testament is full of them, nor doubting your belief of that Book, I have ventured to oppose my friends, almost to altercation, and assert your assent to conviction, &c. By condescending to notice this, you will render your pamphlet more interesting and useful and confer a real favor on your

FRIEND.

REPLY.

The Editor is happy to acknowledge his obligation to his "Friend" for the above communication, and assure him of a most cheerful compliance with his very candid and unassuming request. One favor, however, he solicits of "Friend," and that is, that he would ask those tenacious people, whether they presume we deny the importance of conviction, &c. because those *words* are not found in our numbers, or because we have not made these points the subjects for illustration. The former we are sure it could not be, if they had read with suitable candor; for we have used those *words*, *ten*, yea, *an hundred* times oftener, than they are in the New Testament. Those who are not possessed of sufficient biblical information to be already convinced of this, may easily satisfy themselves, by reading both, and collating the words, conviction, conversion and reformation. If they think we have not contended for a genuine reformation, let them but candidly peruse the "Short Sermon" in the last number. We fear the subject is treated too evangelically, and points with too much truth at the heart, to be read, without shutting "the mind's eye."

CONVICTION, CONVERSION, REFORMATION.

Professing to believe in the necessity of Conviction, Conversion and Reformation, to constitute an experimental Christian, we shall pursue a course in exhibiting our views, to which the sincere and enlightened will not object. Instead of appealing to the opinions and imaginations of professors, to be stunned with the vociferations of each sect, claiming to themselves the apostolic doctrine and experience, we shall come directly to the Bible; willing to be tried by that standard, and, if found wanting, bear the inscription, "MENE, TEKEL." Those who are unwilling to abide this trial, must, like empty vessels, be considered more *noisy* than *ponderous*.

Will the reader believe, when we inform him that the word, *conviction*, is not found in our translation of the Bible? As much as is said and written, about "being under conviction," "ever since conviction," "how long did his

conviction last," "a convicting sermon," &c. we find no such words in Scripture. Neither *convict*, *convicting* nor *conviction* are so much as mentioned in the volume of inspiration. Why have we not as good reason to presume, that neither the inspired writer or the translator embraced these doctrines, as that Christians of the present day, do not, because half their writings are not composed of those words? Should these remarks "provoke each other" to a more careful perusal of the inspired writings, our reward will be certain.

The word, **CONVICTED**, is once used, and as follows: "And they which heard it, being *convicted* by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even to the last." John, viii. 9. Look at the connection, inquirer; and as this is the only place where the word is found, you can dwell upon it for a moment. What did the preacher say which had such an operation? What was that *convicting discourse* about? Was it a declaration of endless torments? What did it say about *electing grace*? How much difference did it make between "us" and "them"? O, that we could have more such preaching and prevent people from *throwing stones*. They were convicted by their *conscience* or *common sense*, by, or in which, all conviction is wrought that is of any essential service.

To *convict* is to *convince*; therefore, every man is convicted of sin when convinced he has committed it. If a neighbor defraud another, and is convinced of its malignity, he will always be under conviction when he reflects on the same. *Idiots* have no conviction, because they have no conscience or common sense, and are not accountable. To *convict* people of sins they never committed, and have them *repent* of crimes by the *gross*, and have one conviction and conversion, answer for life, is doubtless an invention of priestcraft, and favorable in the end to the greatest dissimulation. Conviction is necessary as long as men commit sins. There are different degrees to the poignancy of conviction, corresponding to the nature of the crime, or the views we have of it. It is by no means certain that men are not convicted of iniquities, because they do not forsake them. Could we see with the eye of Heaven, what a bleeding, writhing and groaning of spirits we should behold,

even under a mask of mirth and the sanctimonious grimaces of religion. It is efficacious only when it reaches the understanding, giving virtue a rational preference to iniquity.

CONVERSION.

The word **CONVERSION** is used but once in the Scriptures, and denotes the prevalence of Christianity among the Gentiles, “ Declaring the *conversion* of the Gentiles.” **Acts, xv. 3.**

The word, **CONVERT** and its *derivatives*, is mentioned about *twelve* times, and is sometimes to be understood of a *turning* from one doctrine to another, and sometimes of a change of moral character. To Peter it was said, “ When thou art *converted* strengthen thy brethren;” **Luke, xxii. 32**, which related to the doctrinal change with which he met, by the “ great sheet” thrice let down from heaven. **Acts, x.** Again; “ if any of you do *err* from the *truth*, and one *convert* him,” &c. **James, v. 19.** This conversion is produced by the persuasion of a brother.

When we read, “ Except ye be *converted* and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of God,” and “ *repent* ye, therefore, and be *converted* that your sins may be blotted out,” we are to understand a change of disposition or moral character. **Matthew, xviii. 3, and Acts, iii. 19.** The alteration should be read to correspond with this definition of conversion. When we behold a child-like teachable disposition and a voluntary return from iniquity, we may consider the conversion from above. It is synonymous with turning from wickedness to learn of him who is meek and lowly of heart, by which iniquities are “ *blotted out.*” Whenever men transgress, they need a conversion. When the Church departs from the Lord, may “ **Zion** be redeemed with judgment, and her *converts* with righteousness.” **Isaiah, i. 27.**

REFORMATION.

Reformation is once mentioned in the Bible, and imports the abolition of the forms and ceremonies of the Mosaic law, by the introduction of pure Christianity. “ Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and

carnal ordinances, imposed on them till the time of *reformation.*" Hebrews, ix. 10.

The return of the Israelites from idolatry and sin, is, in Leviticus, xxvi. 23, expressed by the word, "*reformed.*" Hence we see the obvious meaning of a reformation, is, to be made better in principle or practice, or both. Because we are assured two men have reformed, we are not to infer a similar change; one may reform in his conduct, the other in his principles.

Doubtless this biblical account of conviction, conversion and reformation will greatly disappoint many readers. Disappointed that the words are so unfrequently found in the Bible, and that the doctrines partake no more of the marvellous! These points, we learn, are by no means peculiar to christianity; they are held in different modifications, in all religions. All have their requisition and prohibition, transgression and conviction, conversion and reformation, according to their views of right and wrong. Christians use these words in various senses. When a nation, Jew or Heathen, embraces Christianity, they are said to be *converted*, though they will then need an individual change of moral feeling. The *reformation* in the sixteenth century, respected *doctrines*, altogether. Even the reformers themselves stood in need of a reformation. The conversion of Constantine the Great, related to his faith; for who believes *he* was *converted* from his sins, who dared not be baptized till the hour of his death? How many have pretended to see visions, or the cross in the cloud, or some other wonder, to be *honored* with conviction, conversion and reformation, while their hearts were in the gall of bitterness, and their hands dyed in blood. "Believest thou this?"

IS HE A UNIVERSALIST?

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

Mr. EDITOR—Having understood you intended occasionally to expose to the world the conduct of those, who, with "heart and voice" have opposed the doctrine of

“ Universal Salvation ;” I take the liberty to communicate what fell under my personal observation, and what is now generally known, in the vicinity where it happened.

Four years ago, a young gentleman (of Calvinistic sentiments) was employed as an instructor of youth in the second parish in Plymouth ; in which capacity, he acquitted himself with honor ; and at the expiration of his engagement, the committee, in behalf of the district, presented him with a certificate of having given “ general satisfaction ” to the people of said district. Among his applauders was a deacon, a dissenter from the church in that place, because their Pastor had changed his views respecting the Trinity. Two years after this, the young gentleman first mentioned visited the second parish in Plymouth, which was then in great confusion about religion ; there being what is usually termed a “ reformation ” among them. The scenes disclosed at their meetings I shall not attempt to portray ; although tales might be told, which would make decency blush. However, a few, not “ totally depraved,” waited on Mr. ——, and expressed a wish that he would instruct their school the then ensuing winter : He replied, that if requested by the committee, he would : The committee were accordingly informed ; two of whom (the committee consisted of three) expressed their approbation of the man ; but the third, was the “ pious deacon,” who had heard that the young man, under consideration, had become a believer in the “ common salvation ” of all men. On this ground he opposed him, and on this only. He had no other possible objection ; as the gentleman’s character was irreproachably good, and his literary acquirements more than competent, and had previously been highly applauded in that place. But the deacon, notwithstanding, by influence and intrigue, accomplished his object, and the young gentleman was rejected. Yes, reader, because he was an “ Universalist,” he was excluded from his rights in the community. Is not this holding in subordination “ one sect or denomination to another ?” Had this instructor been a believer in the doctrine of “ unconditional election and reprobation,” no doubt this “ pious deacon,” would have employed him with pleasure. But because he believed God would be merciful to *all*, instead of a few, and that in “ due time Christ died

for the ungodly," as well as the righteous ; this "pious deacon" declares him as dangerous in society ; and that he would be especially so among the youth of that place, if put under his instruction.

What, I ask, would such "pious" men do, if they had power ? Would not the horrors of an inquisition, which, is at length driven from Europe, find an asylum in this "land of Gospel liberty ?" And would not the tragedy of *Servetus* be re-acted, by these devoted followers of the reformer ? How much better is such religion than Mehometanism ? And do not its supporters maintain it in the same way, to the full extent of their power ? These are the men who profess to be followers of the "meek and lowly Jesus ;" that Jesus, who said to his disciples (when they told him they saw one casting out devils, and forbade him because he followed not them) "forbid him not, for he that is not against us, is for us." But it is doubtfull, whether, even our Saviour himself could escape the anathemas of these "demonstrators of the right," if he should now appear on earth, with sentiments differing from those of their leader, the celebrated John Calvin.

Whether the doctrine of the final restoration of all things be true, or not, is not now the question : but this *persecuting spirit* I consider unfriendly to the cause of religion, and therefore, think it ought to be exposed to the view of all, that it may be "cast out, and trodden under foot of men." They may "pay tithe of mint, annise and cummin ;" yet so long as they omit "the weightier matters ;" among which I shall reckon "charity, which suffereth long, and is kind" they are "become as a sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. " And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three ; but the greatest of these is CHARITY.

New-England, January 2, 1822.

THE EDITOR'S APOLOGY.

The following extract and reply would not be published in this work, was it not conceived to be the most proper method that can be taken, to correct erroneous impressions among the candid, liberal Christians, in this vicinity, and

let our readers know generally, the employment of many in this place, who profess to have met with a *change of heart*, as taught in the scriptures. We are happy however to state, that we believe there are many pious, peaceable Christians, in the Church from which the following untruths originated; and those too, who are much mortified at the conduct of those *run-about*s. Whoever has heard the Parson of that parish in his severe and lashing animadversions of his Church, is doubtless convinced that he is not only *opposed* to such reprehensible conduct, but is sensible there are many who *deserve* chastisement. Neither would the innocent and pious part of the Church, be willing to have the *infamous tatlers* and *hawkers* lashed, as “with a scourge of small cords,” over their shoulders, unless they knew there were such among them. If this be considered uncharitable, and either the *minister* or any of the *respectable* part of his Church, will give it as their opinion, there are none such, a recantation shall appear in our next. We make these remarks that the whole of them may not be censured.

EXTRACT.

“When you preached here (*Westbrook*) we understood you to hold, that we must be born again and be holy, in order to be prepared for heaven; and all denominations understood you alike. But when we are in *Portland*, our *Calvinist* brethren tell us, you deny *all revealed religion*, and say men are naturally good enough; deny there is a devil, hell, or *any change of heart*—and, even go where people are under conviction, and *offer them money to buy them off*, &c. and that most of your society have *denied the doctrine*, and they should think you would leave off preaching.”

REPLY.

The editor has no doubt that the above, and many other equally groundless things have been reported, and that some people of small privileges will be frightened by them, and be heard to say many things of which they will, hereafter, be both ashamed and sorry. But those “*busy bodies*” know not what they are doing; they are only preparing the way for the greater spread of truth, by leading people

to inquire and look the more carefully into their doctrines, and on making work for repentance for themselves. They would be very unwilling to see a *circumstantial history* of their own proceeding, for *twelve years past*. Our prayer is, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The people who report such foolish untruths, have never heard the Editor *deny* the necessity of the new-birth, that there was a devil and hell, or offer money to prevent conviction for sin ; and it is not probable they have candor enough, either to hear him preach or converse, or read his writings. Is it not evident, they speak of the things they *know not*, and testify of what they have *not seen*? The character of those *walking bundles of silk*, is thus drawn by the pencil of Paul :—" And withal they learn to be idle, *wandering* about from *house to house* ; and not only idle, but **TATLERS** also and **BUSY BODIES**, speaking things which they ought not." I. Tim. v. 13. Now our friendly advice is, since " whoso hateth his brother is a murderer," that they so conduct as " not to suffer as a *murderer*, or as a *thief*, or as an *evil doer*, or as a **BUSY BODY** in other **MEN'S** matters ; " adorning themselves in *modest* apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety : not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array, but with **GOOD WORKS** !"

Had we *ever doubted* the existence of a devil, we should now be convinced of our error, or that these *religious gypsies* have " run before they were sent." Though " he was a liar from the beginning," by his sending them to describe *fortunes* in " the world to come" of which *he* and *they* are alike ignorant, and of which he is not the ruler, we think the " Prince of the power of the lying breath," does not exhibit so much wisdom as he did formerly. Either his *head* is *bruised* so as to produce derangement, or he is old and superannuated and has revealed to " Delilah his secrets," or committed his treasure to " the weaker vessel." In either case he ought to be *impeached*.

If there be no *hell*, why do our enemies " weep and wail and gnash their teeth ?" If they are not " tormented with the stream of fire and brimstone" " which is poured" upon their heads, when assembled " in the presence of the holy angels and of the Lamb," pray tell us who is ? It cannot injure those who are not there ; consequently, those whom

they say, are forever *banished from* his presence, will not drink fire and brimstone *in* his presence. Every man is in *hell* when he feels the *guilt of sins*; *other hells* are as harmless as “the burning fiery oven, into which, Daniel was cast, though raised to the seventh degree of effervescence.

That any of our society has *apostatized* from the faith, is beyond our knowledge. It is believed that some of the “great men” of the 2d parish did exhibit so much craft, as to make a delirious man say, That he had some doubts. Had he been “in his right mind,” the *net* of questions would have bound him, as a *spider’s web* would hand-cuff a Sampson.

Why should it be thought advisable for me to leave off preaching, if it convinces people my doctrine is untrue? It must be those who *hear* that become convinced. That being the case, it is thought best to continue preaching; for the people are very attentive, and exhibit the greatest desire to know “the whole truth.”

That we *offer money* to buy off from conviction is too ridiculous to be mentioned. None but a *Calvinistic dandy* would have the unblushing impudence to put such a *fortune-book* into the *mouths* of “the busy bodies.”

The doctrine of the *new birth* is an essential article in our preaching. Christians of generous feelings, of all persuasions, know we defend it, and those who have *heard* will testify to this truth. We hold to the new-birth according to the following Scriptures. John i. 12, 13.—III. 3. i. Peter, i, 22, 23. i. John, III. 1, 2, 9. iv. 7, 8. v. 1, 2. But this is putting *away* the heart of stone, or stony heart, and *taking* a *new* one. Ezekiel, xxxvi. 26. Now those who pretend to have *exchanged* hearts, and yet have the stony heart, are surely mistaken. There is a difference between *exchanging* hearts, or giving up the old one and receiving the new, and having the *heart changed*. If they have both hearts, they are *double hearted*, according to Psalms, xii. 2. “They speak vanity every one with his neighbor: with *flattering* lips, and with a *double heart* do they speak.” Of this description there is a busy multitude. Though the words, *heart* and *hearts* are used about a *thousand* times in the Bible, there is but *one* place, we believe, where a **CHANGE OF HEART** is expressed, and that is as

follows, viz : “ Let his **HEART BE CHANGED** from a man’s, and let the *heart of a beast* be given unto him.” Daniel, iv. 16. Now we have no doubt but those who have circulated the reports, which elicited these remarks, *have met* with that *change of heart* ; for by their fruits we know them. When the time has come that our proud and haughty enemies are humbled, we pray God *with all our hearts*, that their *sins may be forgiven*, that we may *unitedly* bless the most High, whose kingdom is from generation to generation.

“ **PIOUS FRAUDS**,” A MIRROR.

In Bucks Theo. Dictionary. p. 393, we have the following, ; “ **PIOUS FRAUDS** are those *artifices* and *falsehoods* made use of in *propagating the truth*, and endeavoring to promote the *spiritual* interests of mankind. These have been more *particularly* practised in the church of Rome, and considered not only innocent but commendable.” So it appears they have not been confined wholly to the church of Rome, though *more* of it has been practised there, than in other churches ! But was the Doctor to write again, and without prejudice, it is questionable where he would see most of those *pious practices*. There is much artifice now used, and many falsehoods circulated among those who *profess* “ to propagate the truth and promote the spiritual interest of mankind.” By what name shall we better describe the following conduct, than by *pious frauds* ?

Pious Preachers profess to believe that God has a *chosen number* in the human family, whom he *foreordained* for eternal life, and has, in covenant, given them to his Son, and that no one can pluck them out of his hands ; and yet they pretend that they are hourly in *danger* of dropping into hell ; and the *preachers* pretend they cannot sleep, being so alarmed for their souls.

Pious people, converted under their preaching, believe they *were chosen* in Christ from eternity, and yet, they shed crockodile-tears, in relating a *pretended* narrow escape from endless misery !

Pious men go about "from house to house" to chastise people for "proving all things, that they may hold fast what is good;" and *threaten to withhold* the *hand of charity*, if they go "to hear what the babbler has to say!"

The pious of both sexes that pretend to have *new hearts*, and "follow him who was born in a manger," discourage *strangers* from going to a certain meeting, as far as possible, by telling them the Society is made up of the most infamous and abandoned characters. If these be "pious frauds" we hope some of the *pious* people will look into this **MIRROR.**

DEDICATIONS.

We are happy to learn that during the last season, no less than **SEVEN** new and commodious Houses, for public worship, were **DEDICATED** to the service of God, in the Commonwealth of the General Convention of Universalists. One in Roxbury, Milford, Westminster, Brookfield, *Mass.* one in Otsego, Madison, *N. Y.* and one in Portland, *Me.*

The House in Portland, was commenced by a few "Israelites indeed," and progressed with unexampled rapidity to its completion, which was short of *three months*. The utmost harmony and good fellowship prevailed, from the moment it was said "Let us build an house to the Lord," till "the chief corner stone" "was brought forth," at the **DEDICATION**; when we heartily exclaimed, "Praise ye the **LORD**, for he is **GOOD**; for his **MERCY ENDURETH FOREVER**. **PRAISE YE THE LORD.**"

Though "the sound of the axe, hammer and" almost every "tool of iron, was heard on the building," from *five* in the morning to *seven* in the evening, still, as great harmony was seen among the workmen, as at the erection of the Solomonian temple; and neither *violence* nor *accident* was beheld, to damp the ardor of "so glorious an undertaking." The master-workman and several of the others, were favorable to the erection of the house, and did themselves lasting honor, both for their assiduity and faithfulness, the display of ingenuity and economy, neatness and elegance; without the pageantry of *Pagodas* or the rusticity

of the *birth-place* of the Son of Mary. The building is *seventy-five* by *forty-six* feet, with a convenient gallery in front of the desk for the singers, and several pews on either hand. There is a well proportioned tower of an *hundred* and *thirty* feet in height, in which, is a sufficiently large and well-toned *bell*; for a considerable part of which, we are in gratitude indebted, to liberal and generous Christians in this place. That the intervening time, from the oaks, waving in the forest, to their making the beams of a completely finished house, in which the solemnities of Dedication and Installation were performed, should be less than *ninety days*, has been a matter of no inconsiderable surprise. But it only corresponds with the maxim, “United we stand; divided we fall.” Long, very long may the brethren live, who erected that house, and those who worship there, and know “how good and how pleasant it is, for brethren to dwell together in unity.”

On the 16th of August, it was religiously and solemnly **DEDICATED** to the worship and service of the one God, whose universal love is manifested for the salvation of the world, through one Lord Jesus Christ, and impressed upon the heart of every man, by the gift and influence of one Holy Spirit. The services commenced with an appropriate anthem, performed to the highest admiration of a numerous audience.

Our Rev. Br. **BALLOU**, of Boston, made the introductory and Consecrating prayer, in a manner, uncommonly devout, solemn and fervent. Rev. Br. **STREETER**, of Portsmouth, delivered the **Dedication Sermon**, from *Haggai*, chapter II. 6, 7, 8, 9. “For thus saith the **LOLD** of hosts, Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land. And I will shake all nations, and the **DESIRE** of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the **LORD** of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the **LORD** of hosts; and in this place will I give peace, saith the **LORD** of hosts.” The discourse was appropriate, ingenious, able and evangelical, and pronounced with that fervor and eloquence which left a most favorable and lasting impression on the hearts of a crowded, brilliant and respectable audience. Rev. Br. **COBB**, of Waterville, followed in solemn and fervent prayer.

In the P. M. Br. RUSSELL STREETER, was Installed over the Society in Portland. Brother BALLOU made the prayer, and delivered a DISCOURSE, from JEREMIAH, III. 15. "I will give you Pastors after mine heart, that shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." The arguments were cogent, the arrangement judicious, the subject appropriate and the oratory masterly. Many who were not present, were afterwards filled with admiration, by the relation of intelligent gentlemen, of the pulpit performances of the day. May we not say, as did one on a different occasion, concerning the Grecian orator, "What would have been their feelings, while sitting under the *storm of eloquence*." Br. STREETER made the Installation prayer, and presented the Hand of Fellowship ; and Brother COBB closed by fervent prayer and thanksgiving. Mr. DAVIS and his respectable CHOIR, performed in a manner suitable to the importance of the occasion. "O, that men would praise the Lord for his goodness ; and for his wonderful works to the children of men."



PUBLICATIONS.

Several interesting, argumentative and ably edited PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS are now in circulation, devoted to the defence of the gospel of God, which bringeth life and immortality to light, unclouded with the horrors of eternal death or endless misery, viz :

THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE, published at Boston, every Saturday, by Mr. Henry Bowen, of which the third volume is nearly out. Price two dollars fifty cents per annum, in advance.

THE GOSPEL HERALD, published at the City of New-York, every Saturday, by Mr. Henry Fitz, devoted wholly to theological discussion and inquiry ; of the same size of the Magazine, though folded in a pamphlet form ; of which the 2d volume is nearly completed. Price, as the above.

THE CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY, a quarterly work, by Rev. Br. S. C. Loveland, of Reading, Vt. each number containing thirty two duodecimo pages, the 2d Vol. finished in the next number. Price fifty cents per annum.

THE PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE, published at the city of Philadelphia, under the patronage of the Universalists in that place, and edited by Rev. Br. *Abner Kneeland*, their pastor. It is issued *monthly*, each number containing at least *thirty two* pages octavo ; the *seventh* number of the I. Vol. being out ; and the work "nothing more than the continuation of the Christian Messenger, which, having completed the second volume, is too well known to need further recommendation." Price, *two dollars* per annum.

THE RELIGIOUS INQUIRER, a *semi-monthly* work, published at Hartford City, Conn. by "gentlemen who have associated themselves for the promotion of Christian knowledge ;" and edited by Rev. Br. *Richard Carrique*, now ministering in that city. Each number has *eight* pages, royal octavo size, and *eight* of the I Vol. been issued. Price, *one dollar* per annum.

The highest recommendation we can give a publication, is, to solicit our readers to examine it for themselves, with a full assurance, that in our opinion, it is worthy of a careful and frequent perusal. The above works are ably edited, and mostly devoted to argumentative and controversial subjects. They are the means of disseminating much christian light in our country, and are read by thousands who would otherwise descend to the grave, without understanding the principles of the doctrine we teach. Since other denominations are using unparalleled exertions to support the tottering system of Calvinian Theology, we hope our brethren will not be wholly unmoved, or suffer those useful publications to be discontinued. There has been some labor lost in unprofitable arguments with those, who have attempted to defend the eternity of hell-torments, by certain verbal criticisms. We hope our brethren will not spend *time*, which is *precious*, and paper, ink and labor which are costly, in answering men, whose maxim doubtless is, "DIVIDE and CONQUER."

MISCELLANEOUS.

Annual Meetings. The GENERAL CONVENTION of Universalists, of the four New-England States and others, con-

venes on the *third* Wednesday and Thursday of September; the next meeting to be holden at *Warner, N. H.*

THE NORTHERN ASSOCIATION of Universalists, holden on the *first* Wednesday and Thursday in October; next session in *Barre, Vt.*

THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION, &c. holden at *Lee, Oneida County, N. Y.* the *first* Wednesday and Thursday in June next.

THE EASTERN ASSOCIATION, &c. next to be holden in *Turner, Maine*, the last Wednesday and Thursday in June, 1822.

THE NORTHERN OHIO UNIVERSALIAN ASSOCIATION, organized in September last, adjourned to meet at *Shalersville, Portage County, Ohio*, the *first* Wednesday and Thursday in September.

A semi-annual meeting, called the SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION, which convenes in December and June, the next meeting to be holden, in *Wrentham*, at the Baptist meeting-house, on the *second* Wednesday of June next.

A SOCIETY UNIVERSALIST was formed in *Providence, R. I.* last season, a lot of land purchased on which to erect a meeting-house, and *six thousand dollars* subscribed for its erection. Brother *MACE* of this State has been invited to preach with them next year, and, we understand, complied with their request. The Lord be with our dear brother, grant him grace and wisdom, that he may distribute a portion of meat to each hearer, in due season.

ANOTHER CHURCH. A Church has been recently organized, in *Roxbury, (Mass.)* under the supervision of Br. *Hosea Ballou, 2d.* their Pastor, called, "The first Universalist Church of Christ in Roxbury;" of which, the following is the "Declaration of faith;" viz :

"We believe there is one God; and that in the Scriptures of the Old and New-Testaments, he has given a revelation of his character, of the mission of his Son *Jesus Christ*, and of the duty and final destination of mankind. And we believe that the happiness of all rational creatures depends immediately on their obedience or holiness."

Though we admire the ingenuity with which the above "Declaration" is indited, that it should mean nothing more

than—*We believe the bible*, it would, nevertheless, be extremely gratifying to be informed, why that, in contra-distinction to others, should be named, “The First Universalist Church,” &c. Do not the other Churches in Roxbury, believe the above declaration? We were of opinion that it should be called, “The First Universalist’s Church,” &c. Nothing is discovered, *peculiar* to our doctrine; or that could lead one to suppose that it was any other, than *a church, formed* by Universalists, without expressing their peculiar faith. To say, other Churches profess to believe more than the above, leaves room for queries; whether they profess to believe *more* than they profess to believe is in the Old and New-Testaments? and have they no ground to say the same of the new Church in Roxbury? We are entirely at a loss concerning the object, in making so indefinite a declaration of faith. But reposing great confidence in the talents and ingenuousness of our worthy Br. Ballou, 2d. and the elevation of moral character which that Church and society sustain, we seriously solicit an explanation of their views, in relation to that subject, to which publicity will be given, if requested. If it be the result of sound and prayerful deliberation, it may be the means of correcting many errors, and of doing much good, in other places. If these remarks do not deserve the reprimand, “What is that to thee?” we hope to receive an instructive answer; if they do, “let the righteous smite me, and it shall be an excellent oil.”

Several other societies and churches have been formed within a year past.

QUESTION for the Christian Intelligencer.—Why did Christ **DIE** for us, if God was not unreconciled towards us, and unless we were condemned for Adam’s sin? or how does it benefit us, if we suffer for our transgressions? and what were we redeemed from, if these things be true?

Asa Barton.

ANSWER. 1. Jesus *died* to manifest the **LOVE** of God, not his anger; and God was *in Christ* reconciling the *world to himself*—not himself to the world. Rom. v. 8. I John, iv. 10. II Cor. v. 18, 19.

2. There is as much need of being saved from our *own*

sins, as though another's were imputed and imparted to us. Matt. i. 21. Acts, iii. 19, 20, 21.

3. The death of Jesus, or the love of the Father therein displayed, will benefit man, by saving him *from transgression*, that he may *no longer deserve* to suffer, or his former sins be brought into remembrance. Acts, iv. 10, 11, 12. Rom. x. 9, 10. Heb. viii. 10, 11, 12. Ezek. xviii. 21, 22, 23.

4. Salvation from sin is a redemption or *deliverance* from condemnation and pain, which is the curse of the law. Psalm cxxx. 8. Titus, ii. 14. Gal. iii. 13. Matt. xxvii. 46.

SEVEN STRONG REASONS

FOR BELIEVING ALL MEN WILL BE SAVED.

“ And be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a **REASON** of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear.”

I. Peter, iii. 15.

REASON 1. Because both reason and Revelation teach that God is *good* and *merciful* to all men, created all things for his pleasure, and will accomplish his purpose in the dispensation of the fulness of times; and it is *neither good* nor *merciful* to create beings to be endlessly miserable. Ps. cxlv. 7, 8, 9. Rev. v. 11. Eph. i. 9, 10, 11.

2. God has but one **WILL**, and that he has *expressly revealed* in the scriptures, viz. He **WILL** have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth; and he is unchangeable, and cannot, therefore, have any *other will*. I. Tim. ii. 4. Phill. ii. 13. James, i. 17.

3. God sent his Son into the world, to do his **WILL**, and suffer nothing finally to be lost; and with him was well pleased. John, vi. 33. xvii. 2, 3. Matt. iii. 17.

4. JESUS, in perfect obedience to his Father, gave himself a ransom for all men, tasted death for every man, and was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. I. Tim. ii. 5, 6, 7. Heb. ii. 9. I. John iv. 10.

5. The **WILL** of God in the salvation of all, harmonizes with the Promises and Prophecies of the Old and New-Testaments. Gen. xii. 1, 2, 3. Gal. iii. 8. Acts, iii. 25, 26. Ps. ii. 8. xxii. 27. Isaiah, xxv. 6, 7, 8. Acts. iii. 20, 21. Rev. v. 13.

6. All rational, benevolent creatures would rejoice in the bliss of all men, and we are commanded to pray for all, and that God's **WILL** may be done in earth, as in heaven. I. John, iv. 20. I. Tim. ii. 1, 2, 3. Matt. vi. 9, 10. xviii. 19.

7. Since none but *evil demons* and *unholy men* are opposed to God's impartial, benevolent, *revealed* and perfect **WILL**, and the Devil and all his works will be destroyed, we ought to be willing to labor and suffer reproach trusting in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those who believe. Rom. viii. 31, 32. Heb. ii. 14, 15. I. John, iii. 8. I. Tim. iv. 10.